



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,962	01/09/2001	Simon Santa-Cruz	00801.0192.NPUS00	9671

22798 7590 03/08/2004

QUINE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, P.C.
P O BOX 458
ALAMEDA, CA 94501

EXAMINER

QIAN, CELINE X

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1636

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/758,962

Applicant(s)

SANTA-CRUZ ET AL.

Examiner

Celine X Qian

Art Unit

1636

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 06 February 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 38.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 7-30, 53-56.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Anne-Marie Falk
ANNE-MARIE FALK, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment introduces a new limitation to the claims (wherein the IRES is heterologous to the plant viral vector) which requires additional search. Therefore, the amendment will not be entered.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed amendment does not overcome the written description rejection of the record. Applicant argues that the disclosure of a core structure is not necessary, and the term IRES is primarily a functional description of a nucleic acid sequence which is adequately described in the specification. In response to this argument, Applicant is reminded that the written description requirement requires the specification describe a representative number of species by their complete structure or other identifying characteristics. As admitted by Applicant that IRES is a functional description, then the specification must describe their structure characteristics to satisfy the written description requirement. The claimed genus is "naturally occurring IRES or a fragment," which encompasses potentially a large number of nucleic acid molecules of various length and sequences. The specification does not describe a representative number of such IRES or fragments by their complete structure, nor other identifying characteristics (such as a core structure). Therefore, the written description requirement is not met. Applicant further argues that in the final office action that the Examiner mischaracterize applicant's arguments that directs to lack of motivation to create the claimed invention. However, it is unclear which part of the office action contain such mischaracterization. In addition, the alleged difference between the cited references and the claimed invention is not a limitation in the claims. As such, the claims are rejected for same reasons set forth in the previous office action. As discussed above, the proposed amendment changes the scope of the claims, therefore, would require new search. Therefore, the amendment would not be entered.